

DEVOLVING TREASON

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

In the Shorter Oxford Dictionary, the first two definitions of the word "devolve" are: "To cause anything to descend or fall upon": "To cause anything to descend with a rolling motion". The same source defines treason as "betrayal of trust" . . . "breach of faith". The "anything" descending with a rolling motion, gathers speed but tends like a log on a hill to veer off course unless it receives continued prodding to keep it going to the bottom.

So, now we see. The treasonable policies of successive governments that have betrayed the trust of the Queen's loyal subjects all round the world and appeared to halt in the Common Market, are to be directed down again, this time upon the constituent parts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. The latest tentative tap has been administered by the wily Wilson accompanied by a promise of more decisive pushes at some later date by the apparently indestructible Humpty Dumpty Heath. At least they are prodding true to form so that the momentum will be maintained whoever is doing the devolving. We must expect soon to see the disappearance of the crosses of Saints Andrew, Patrick and George from national ensigns so that a variety of less controversial emblems may flourish like the red maple leaf.

As treason, especially that of the nature inherent in the pursuance of *One World* is top fashion nowadays it was predictable that ambitious vendors in Scotland and Wales would hardly be able to wait to open their own boutiques for dealing in it, whilst like figures in Northern Ireland prefer to bargain with bombs for their own corner in the Eirean Arcade already established in the European Common Market.

The latest spate of television/radio current affairs and "discussion" programmes is evidently directed to convince any obstinate doubters that the passionate desire of all peoples is to make their submission to any government but their existing one; to any cause but their own cause; to any creed but their own creed. "World Religion", we are told, is as necessary as "World Government" for the final triumph of justice and peace! God must be rendered unto Caesar.

Those of us who have no doubts about the infamy of the proceedings by which a company of great nations is being delivered piecemeal to perdition, can only iterate and reiterate that the way to One World will be followed by the majority of peoples just so long as they do not know where and to what they are going.

To conceal the hell to which our leaders are blazing the betrayal, they keep always far enough in front to be just out of sight around the next bend, thus inducing the most of us to labour after them with down-cast eyes that never see the trees for the wood. It is for *Candour* to turn its torch on those revealing signs, that all who now run blindly may look up and read them.

AMERI-EURO MARKET

When parliamentary Celtic nationalists proclaim their demands for independence from the bespoke Westminster Government, they take care not to emphasize their ultimate aim of total dependence in the equally bespoke E.E.C.

When British parliamentarians advocate the imagined advantages of the Common Market as a Third Force to break the demi-hegemony of the U.S.A.—U.S.S.R., they do not mention the fact that promotion of the E.E.C. has been an "American" objective these many years, as *Candour* has publicised from the beginning. So much is it so that when our somersaulting Callaghan was pandering to the reluctance of the British people to be sunk in Europe, an American pundit was found to say (on a B.B.C. early morning overseas broadcast) that if Europe would not unite on its own, the U.S.A. would have to withdraw its forces from N.A.T.O. and then "Europe" would be forced to combine for defence. European unity would in fact have to be a gift from the United States. That seems to have been one of those too revealing comments never to be repeated. It is a threat on a par with Eisenhower's to Eden in 1956—economic sanctions if he did not pull the British forces out of Suez. All those naive voters for British entry to the E.E.C. might have shown the other reaction if they had known that the Third Force was intended from the

beginning to be just another agency for the dispensation of aid to the U.S.S.R. with love from the U.S.A. Proof, if more is needed, comes hot from the campaign accounts of *Britain in Europe*. Among the major donors were the U.S. based Ford Company, I.T.T., Chrysler and Mobile Oil. So likely that they would kick in to the amount of ten or twenty thousand pounds apiece to promote the establishment of an arch rival. If that does not dot and cross the I.T.T.'s nothing will. So much for any nation's independence in that setup.

THE FRENCH CONNECTION

Consider the saga of our latest technological triumph, Concorde. According to the euphoric comment following Mr Secretary Coleman's favourable decision concerning limited landing permission for New York and Washington, we are alleged to have won a famous victory. Yet all the signs are there to show that it will be rendered as hollow as any other won by British brains and brawn. The silent "e" on Concord stands for evidence of a self inflicted defeat in one of the battles of the Third World War that Solzhenitsen rightly declares to be over. It was the battle for the TSR II. Wholly British in design and construction, that aircraft was judged by experts to be "the finest that ever flew", whereupon it was hurriedly taken to pieces by order of our own Government before the British public, who had paid for it, could discover even that it had flown at all. Air Chief Marshal Harris remarked in 1945 that the next war would be fought by little men with bombs in suitcases. He was wrong; it was fought—and won, by little men with secrets in diplomatic bags.

Now we are engaged in the Fourth World War when it seems our enemies within and without no longer have to bother with diplomatic bags to send secrets across allegedly hostile frontiers. The "e" on Concord also stands for the engines which power the Anglo-French marvel. Where did their design come from? Why, the TSR II of course. Where will they ultimately go—if not already installed? Why, to that remarkable blotted copy known through the media as Concorfski. Who can doubt it? When, to boost the Anglo-French-Soviet Concord-e-ski the French have lately issued a stamp incorporating the Tricolor with the Hammer and Sickle to celebrate fifty years of diplomatic relations. Hey presto! No bag is needed. The cat has not only been let out, it is being fed in public on the very finest cuts.

ANGOLAN CURIOSITIES

Away to the South the situation in Angola gets curiouser and curiouser. Only a few weeks ago television audiences here were shown a map of that country. In the North was a large slice marked F.N.L.A.; in the South an even larger slice marked

U.N.I.T.A., and between them a tiny sliver, based on Luanda, marked M.P.L.A. All the indications were that the M.P.L.A. was about to be eliminated as a fighting force. Two weeks or so passed, during which almost the only mention of Angola consisted of speculation on the amount of "wicked" South African involvement in what was "a purely domestic struggle". Then another map was produced showing the M.P.L.A. spread over two thirds of the country. Cuban soldiers with Russian equipment were suddenly present, operating with stunning efficiency. South Africans who had always denied being there were retiring at speed whilst calling for United States assistance. All this was seemingly being gleaned from M.P.L.A. leaders, Cuban soldiers, U.N.I.T.A. commanders and black contingents allegedly from Zaire, gathered in some unspecified place fifty miles from the forbidden "battle area" wherever that was.

Everyone interviewed, except the Cubans, spoke some kind of English. No one appeared to find that strange, although Angola has been Portuguese for five hundred years, and is next door to the French-speaking erstwhile Belgian Congo. For all the interest shown in combat logistics the Cubans might have arrived by magic conveyor belt and the Russian equipment descended by parachute from outer space.

"Foreign" intervention was invariably understood to mean South African intervention. Wise Mr Kissinger was not going to be embroiled in "another Viet Nam" at the instigation of white racists when a colour blind eye cast on Angola might induce Soviet hands to sign a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, possibly just in time for a presidential election bonus.

Britons may remember the Macmillan-Home recipe for weathering the results of the "wind of change". It was a Non-Proliferation Treaty. With strategic arms now proliferating in all directions except South Africa's, we need an X-ray picture of the current world scene to allow us to "read the bones".

N.A.T.O. AND THE RED MAPLE LEAF

In the middle of January the Canadian Government admitted that Cuban troops bound for Angola had gone through Gander, Newfoundland. One would have thought that such an admission would have rated headlines all over the so-called Free World—instead it fell into a pool of silence. No one asked why it was necessary for troops in a hurry to travel approximately two thousand miles in the wrong direction. No one wondered where refuelling had taken place on the second leg. Common information suggests the Azores—Portuguese territory but also the site of a N.A.T.O. base. If that was the case, how did it happen that no one in the Western defence force against Communism alerted the opponents of the Marxist M.P.L.A.? An Atlantic defence force that fails to

notice alien troop movements on a civilian airport in nearby Santa Maria should cause those who rely on it for protection to tremble at their own naivety.

Co-incidentally with this peculiar lack of "intelligence", *The Jewish Chronicle* of January 23rd was rejoicing over the prospect of "£90 million 'eyes' to protect Israel". Its New York correspondent reported:

"If the United States Congress approves, and there is every indication that it will, Israel will be supplied with four of the most sophisticated radar aircraft in the world's arsenal, which would become the eyes and ears of the F-15 Eagles Israel is also to receive from the United States. . . . 'the four Gruman E2C Hawkeye aircraft have never been released to other military establishments by the U.S.'"

Presumably the Azores N.A.T.O. base is just one of those other "military establishments" with such unsophisticated eyes that it doesn't know what goes on in the same archipelago.

A few days after the "Gander" admission, a dozen lines on an inside page of *The Times* newspaper were the most that was thought necessary to inform its readers that the Canadian Prime Minister had just concluded a "successful" three week visit to Cuba. Yes, Cuba—where he made himself "very popular". His farewell cries of "Long Live Cuba" evoked enthusiastic cheers from delighted Cubans waving goodbye.

No wonder the visit was popular. It must have been then that the "charismatic" Trudeau offered Castro the alternative route made necessary by the West Indies' refusal to allow any more Cuban troops through Barbados and neighbouring islands. (Possibly they were interfering with the tourist trade.)

THE COMMON MARKET THE DANGERS WE FACE ON ALL FRONTS by KEVAN BLEACH

The recommendations of the Tindemans Report on the development of European Union show what a fraud were the arguments used by the pro-Marketeers during last year's referendum campaign. When forced to outline where the E.E.C. was going, they either blandly declared it to be no more than a trading agreement with no political connotations—remember Toynbee? "All the while we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands"?—or else, altogether refused to be drawn. Sir Con O'Neil, the "Britain-in-Europe" director, was reported as warning Tory MPs, "Don't talk about where the Community goes—it frightens people to death". Having got us safely trapped in the E.E.C., the

Canadian readers of *Candour* will not be surprised at their, "by-the-skin-of-his-teeth" Prime Minister's partiality for Communist causes, and others may recall A.K.C.'s note in June, 1971:

"Trudeau has at last shown his hand. On his visit to Moscow he proclaimed the 'partnership' of Canada and Russia. This explains his promotion to be Canada's Prime Minister within only a few months of being elected to Parliament. More than that, it tends to confirm the suspicion that he is the chosen instrument of Cyrus Eaton of Pugwash, the fanatically pro-Communist multi-millionaire."

Although "thousands of Cubans" are seemingly invisible until they are riding tanks down Luanda high street, the British Government had no difficulty in rounding up a few hundred mercenaries in England and threatening them with everything from prison to loss of passport to "discourage the others" attacking Communists where the war is hot, especially if it should be in defence of South West Africa.

With Kissinger trailing his red-SALT-herring in the White House; with the "partners" in Paris, Ottawa and Washington boasting of their Red relations with Moscow and Peking; with Wilson and Callaghan abetted by Thatcher and Heath in London waging all-out economic war against Rhodesia and South Africa, who will not recognize the red ring of confidantes encircling the world? Their perfidy is plain, but do not let that daunt us—rejoice rather, for every broadcast treason brings new true allies to our cause. Regain the joy of battle. Brandish the truth—it comes from an eternal force and shall not fail.

This war we shall not lose—it is fought for our own souls.

Marketeers evidently felt it safe to manoeuvre openly to the European Union they have always sought. Hence the commissioning of the Tindemans Report.

The substance of Mr. Tindemans' recommendations is three-fold. First and foremost, he argues that economic and monetary union should continue to be the Market's objective, with a forging-ahead by those member-states belonging to the E.E.C.'s joint float or currency "snake". Such a development would leave Britain with a double burden to bear: not only would we still be in the E.E.C.'s clutches, but on vital decisions concerning economic policies we should be effectively excluded as these would be left to West

Germany and France to decide. Britain would be dancing without even a chance to call one note in the tune. Tindemans' statement that the goal of economic and monetary union by 1980 has been discarded should blind no-one to the fact that this will still be pressed ahead with all urgency.

The other main proposals are that the functions of the E.E.C. should cover a common defence policy and that the bureaucratic powers of the Commission and the Council of Ministers should be extended. The former has only one meaning for Britain—that we (and the other Western European nations, at that) shall be further divested of any ability to use our military forces as a sovereign nation. Were it the case that the really vital economic and territorial interests of the Western European powers at all times coincide and form an integral indivisible whole, then perhaps Tindemans' proposals would have some merit. But has history ever shown there to be a permanent alignment of interests among nations? Time is not motionless, and a nation's friends and enemies change continually.

As for the strengthening of the European Commission and Council of Ministers, what effect would this have other than to put the Brussels bureaucracy in an even better position to trample on the interests of nations over wider and wider fields of policy? Tindemans' advocacy of the taking of decisions on the Council of Ministers by majority vote (instead of the current unanimity rule) which has long been an objective of the integrators, can only further facilitate this.

As a tactic to divert public attention away from this additional muscle the E.E.C. bureaucracy is to develop, Tindemans espouses the idea of direct elections to the European Parliament, stating that this will "reinforce the democratic legitimacy of the whole European institutional apparatus". But on closer examination, this proposed "democratic legitimacy" appears rather hollow, for all the European Parliament will be allowed to do is pass resolutions which the Brussels bureaucracy will have the right to boot out should they so fancy. But then, "national politicians", we are told, "would be allowed to take part in debates there on Europe's future". It's odious enough having nine gas-works in the E.E.C. in which the "national politicians" can emit their poisonous utterances at length. Who wants a tenth super-model?!

The whole European Parliament argument is, in any case, an irrelevance. However "democratised" such a centralised structure might be, in reality it would be so remote from the ordinary public in the Nine countries that any notion of democratic control

over one's representatives sitting in it would be meaningless. We have a difficult enough job trying to make our six hundred and thirty-five M.P.s at Westminster kow-tow to public opinion—what hope would we have of influencing a body with such large constituencies that the United Kingdom would merit a mere thirty-six? Then again, what if the European Parliament were given the "teeth" to pass legislation? At whose expense would the sovereign powers be exercised? That's right—Westminster's.

The Tindemans Report, clearly, is a document which anti-Marketees must attack with all their energies because of the very real dangers its proposals portend for us. Yet at the same time we need be on our guard in another direction, for the Report's publication has provided the consortium of establishment politicians and time-servers who monopolised and made such a miserable failure of the National Referendum Campaign, with just the opportunity they were seeking to elbow in again on the anti-Common Market cause. The new umbrella organisation they have formed calls itself the "Safeguard Britain Campaign", though quite how it intends to safeguard Britain from the E.E.C. is a mystery, *since its publications and publicists mention not one word about getting us out of the EEC trap!* All the talk is of "opposing federalism or union". Yet how can the two issues be divided? European union was the *raison d'être* for the formation and development of the Common Market, and it is a nonsense to argue that we can reject the E.E.C.'s federal drive while still retaining membership of the organisation.

The Safeguard Britain Campaign's intention, so it informs us, is to act as "a focus for organisations which came into being to oppose Common Market membership". Was that not the now thankfully dead National Referendum Campaign's purpose, also? And what happened to all those groups that merged with it? They were eagerly swallowed and digested, and those of them who were likely to hurl the unanswerable accusation of "treason" at the pro-Marketees were kept out of the limelight for fear their message should prove too strong. There is no reason to believe any other fate will befall anti-Market groups who merge with this new organisation. Indeed, it is there for the reading, since the Steering Committee envisages a full merging of all individual groups with a total loss of identity at no distant date.

The S.B.C. also seeks representation from the Conservative and Labour Parties on its national committee. What could be more guaranteed to give it the kiss of death than continued participation by the same party politicians whose enfeebling influence converted people's right thinking into the wrong

action during the referendum run-up? In the Campaign's first press conference at the House of Commons earlier this month, its chairman, Labour MP Brian Gould, made it clear that "it is not a case of fighting old battles again. . . . The objective is to see if the Community can develop on acceptable lines." How can *any* development of the Community except its break-up be "acceptable" to those who genuinely seek the restoration of British sovereignty?

Those patriots still determined to fight the Common Market menace lock, stock and barrel should have nothing to do with the safety-valve Safeguards Campaign or with any group affiliated to it. If you are a member of a local anti-E.E.C. group, give it the breath of fresh life and affiliate it to the National Council of Anti-Common Market Organisations. Your group will not be required to merge with them, surrender its own identity or use only the ammuni-

tion they provide. The National Council's policy is to enable groups to fight *as* they want and *where* they want, but all united in a common objective: GETTING BRITAIN OUT OF THE E.E.C. If you prefer to fight along with a movement which puts the Common Market within the general context of the plot to destroy our British nation, and exposes and attacks it as such, you can do no better than to support the National Front. But above all else, help build the circulation of the journal which, from the moment the Common Market scheme was first mooted, has consistently and uncompromisingly opposed it—SUPPORT CANDOUR.

The National Council of Anti-Common Market Organisations, 147 Hornsey Road, London N7 6DU. The National Front, 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex.

CUT AND THRUST

by KEVAN BLEACH

For all their Cuban troops and Russian arms aid, the Angolan Marxist M.P.L.A. evidently know real power when they see it. The "real power" which had the M.P.L.A. transfixed like rabbits in a car's headlights at the end of last month consisted not of battalions of crack soldiers or an arsenal of weapons. It was simply a piece of paper: a memo, to be precise. Received from Washington, it succinctly reminded the M.P.L.A. that they "would do well to heed the advice that no government can plan reconstruction . . . [or] . . . obtain the technological and financial resources to stimulate economic development without official American consent. As anyone should be aware, access to sophisticated technology is a privilege." The memo might have added that no-one is more aware of this privilege they have derived from the Americans than the M.P.L.A.'s backer, the Russians!

The M.P.L.A.'s reaction could hardly have been more obsequious. No denunciation of "Yankee strong-arm financial imperialism" from them! Far from it. What we saw were responses in both public and private to the effect: "Yes, sir, we *will* need American help to reconstruct our country." Their desire to improve relations with Washington was highlighted by the treatment accorded to Mark Moran, foreign policy adviser to Senator John Tuney, who was author of the amendment which stopped the supply of American military aid to M.P.L.A.'s rivals, Unita and F.N.L.A. According to Mr. Moran, although the M.P.L.A. has clearly defined ideas about

"socialising" (i.e. Communising) the economy, several of their leaders went out of their way to emphasise to him the movement was *not opposed in principle to multi-national corporations!*

"This is significant", observed *The Times'* Luanda correspondent coolly. How right! Who would have thought it—Socialist regimes playing politics with the multi-nationals, those bastions of monopoly capitalism? But then, we've seen it all before, in Africa and elsewhere in the world. Although Zaire "socialised" its economy after November 1973 and dispossessed close on 50,000 Whites and many Asians of their property, without so much as a penny in compensation, this has not prevented that country from allowing the United States to become a financial power in the land. Ivor Benson recently revealed in his *Behind Communism in Africa* pamphlet that General Motors are about to build a huge truck assembly plant there, Goodyear and Firestone are now moving in, and S.M.T.F.—a huge international financial group—are building a copper-refining plant worth a couple of hundred million pounds.

Without a doubt, the genuine free-enterprise form of capitalism will go to the wall in "Socialist" Angola, but are we really to believe that the multi-nationals of super-rich capitalism will receive anything but the freest rein? M.P.L.A. leaders, for example, are after Gulf Oil to re-open its operations in Cabinda, where most of the country's oil is produced. They also want a Western company in to exploit the large new field discovered by Texaco off the North coast of Angola,

which could make the country almost as large a producer of oil as Nigeria.

Here the question arises as to what is behind American readiness to subsidise a revolutionary government in Angola which is, at the same time, receiving vast amounts of aid from Communist "powers". Writing on Africa in the early 'fifties, Douglas Reed observed that the "actual aims of American high policy and of the Communist empire are not separate or opposite, but the same", and the complicity which the U.S.A. and the Communist countries have shown in undermining civilised White government in their scramble for possession of the African continent would seem to prove some common power-source directing them. Are we about to see this force manifesting itself in Angola? If so, with what objective? The establishment of Angola as a secure base for an attack upon South-West Africa and finally South Africa itself? It is as plausible an eventuality as any.

The Americans are hotly denying they are acting as Russia's partner in establishing a Marxist state in Angola. Rather, we are now being led to understand that the M.P.L.A. are not Communists after all—or, at any rate, most of them are not—and so need to be weaned away from the Russians. Far from being a monolithic organisation, pontificated the fêted Mark Moran, the M.P.L.A. embraces several streams of opinion—Communist, radical, nationalist and "moderate"—and the last holds the upper hand. What? No "agrarian reformers", like Castro or Mao were once made out to be? As experience teaches us, this is so much hogwash, for it reeks of the same type of cover-up job which accompanied tacit American support for take-overs in China and Cuba.

* * * *

Despite Congress's overwhelming vote to cut off aid to the anti-Marxist forces in Angola, it is interesting to see to what extent massive U.S. aid is continuing to pour into Israel. So substantial was assistance in the military field alone last year that to satisfy Israeli requirements for armaments, the Pentagon was forced to resort to depleting its war reserves. The 1976 aid programme is reported to be so generous that Israel expects to run a payments surplus of 500 million dollars as a result. Obviously there are no fears about the U.S. getting drawn into "another Vietnam" as far as *this* particular part of the world is concerned.

The secret of Israel's unflagging guarantee of whopping amounts of aid, as General George S. Brown revealed a year ago, is the extremely powerful Israeli lobby in the United States. "It is so strong, you wouldn't believe it now", he said. "We have the

Israelis coming to us for equipment. We say we can't probably get the Congress to support a programme like that. They say: 'Don't worry about Congress. We will take care of Congress.'"

Although hysterical Zionists sprang on General Brown like ravenous wolves the moment he uttered these words, none of them denied he spoke the truth. How could they? The omnipotent "we" he referred to has its nucleus in Washington in the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (A.I.P.A.C.), which operates on an annual budget of half-a-million dollars and is the only group formally registered to lobby on behalf of legislation affecting Israel. A.I.P.A.C.'s head, Isaiah Kenan, boasted in the *Washington Post* in December 1974 that he has "cultivated easy access to most members of the House of Representatives and Senate" and has a clear majority of Congressmen willing to vote for pro-Israeli resolutions.

A key factor in A.I.P.A.C.'s effectiveness is the presence on its executive committee of leaders of national Jewish organisations like B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress and a host of others. No small amount of letters and telegrams are forthcoming when these organisations are prompted to alert their large memberships to court individual Congressmen on impending issues affecting Israel. What is more, there have been a number of cases of politicians representing states where Zionists are concentrated, finding themselves rapped across the knuckles pretty sharply if they are not unequivocally one hundred per cent behind Israel in their pronouncements on the Middle East. Ex-Senator Fulbright can testify to this! It is clear the Israelis hardly need worry that they will be left to go to the wall, whoever else does, with such an overwhelmingly powerful lobby to steam-roller U.S. foreign policy in their favour.

* * * *

Something of an outcry greeted one of our own politicians, Reginald Maudling, when he ventured to make a few remarks on the Middle East last November. His boob was that he had the temerity to suggest the Palestinians should have a country of their own and that it was time to recognise the Palestine Liberation Organisation as their voice. Not an unreasonable proposition, it might be thought, for three million people who have been driven out of their homes and forced to live in notorious privation in the desert. But no, Mrs. Thatcher, who is a founder member of the Conservative Friends of Israel and president of her local branch of the Anglo-Israel Friendship League, soon emphasised that it was she, and not Maudling, who would be the source of

Tory policy on the Middle East, and that this policy certainly did not encompass Reggie's bright idea. Party vice-chairman John Moore, who is another founder-member of the C.F.I. as well as an active participant in the Soviet Jewry campaign, similarly laid the law down at a B'nai B'rith luncheon in early January, after reading out a message of good wishes for 1976 to this Jewish Masonic organisation from Mrs. Thatcher.

When it was announced soon afterwards that a major shake-up on the Tory Party's front benches was imminent, there was the distinct sound of knives being sharpened. "I understand", commented the *Jewish Observer's* "Spotlight" columnist, "that not even a miracle can now save Reginald Maudling from losing his Shadow Cabinet post of spokesman on foreign affairs". He went on to say that until such time as Maudling received his marching orders, "his mouth will be sealed on the Middle East". But Reggie's departure was not to be. In her reshuffle Mrs. Thatcher allowed him to stay on as Shadow Foreign Secretary. The *J.O.'s* second prediction has held good though, for not another word have we heard about the Palestinians. A case of once bitten, forever shy?

* * * *

If Mrs. Thatcher thought her speech on Russia had the intended effect of "shaking the British people out of their long sleep", she was mistaken. It had as much effect as an alarm clock with a highly-muffled bell. Certainly as far as it went, her words on the threat posed to Britain and the West by the rapidly increasing military and naval power of the Soviet Union were sound. The evidence of Russian rearmament *does* fly in the face of any notion that they are seeking genuine *détente* and their rise as a naval power *does* endanger our traditional sea lifelines. Sedatives *have* been applied to the British public by fools and traitors in and out of government who have been telling us that there is no external threat to Britain and that propping-up a loss-making company or lending cheap money to Russia is more important than a new squadron of fighter-planes.

Yet where in her speech was the slightest hint of recognition of the forces that have made possible, and are still behind Russia's ever-increasing might? Were Mrs. Thatcher really intent on alerting the British people to the threat confronting them, how could her speech have failed to expose and attack with equal, if not greater, vehemence the international financial power which spawned the Bolshevik regime in 1917 and has ever since nourished its growth into the menacing war-machine it has become today? "The Russians are rapidly acquiring the means", she cried, "to become the most powerful imperial nation the

world has ever seen". But did she ask from where these means were being acquired? "The submarines and missiles the Russians are building", she warned, "could be destined to be used against us". But did she enquire from whom the technical know-how was being obtained? On both counts, she was silent.

It is not lack of conclusive evidence which could have held Mrs. Thatcher back. A study of Anthony Sutton's several scholarly works would have left no doubt in her mind that there is hardly anything worthwhile in the form of modern industry, technology or military hardware which has not been put in Russia by the West in one form or another. Had she button-holed David Rockefeller for just five minutes at the last Bilderberg meeting they both attended, she could have learned from him something of the role his Chase Manhattan Bank is playing in setting up at Kama, four hundred miles east of Moscow, the world's largest truck plant.

For all her true words about the might of Russia, Mrs. Thatcher's speech—possibly out of ignorance, possibly out of deliberation—overlooked the *source* of that might and the motive in its sustenance. The armed power of Russia is but an element, though a very important one, in a global conspiracy to establish an all-powerful World Government, and this one-world imperium will be maintained by whatever means prove expedient—the Red Army, control of the world's currencies, the availability of international loans and so forth. So long as this is appreciated, what Mrs. Thatcher had to say makes not disagreeable reading if all one wants to find out is the present strength of Russian forces. But to look to the Tory leader for any *effective* exposure of the conspiratorial forces presently constituting a threat to Britain and the free world would be a waste of time. On that level, her words about the red threat were no more than a red herring!

* * * *

What a wonderfully diverse society multi-racialism is creating in Britain! Last summer, Gavin Patrick Hampersad, a West Indian and one of the increasing number of overseas students we are having to subsidise, went to his local Social Security office in Thornton Heath to find out why his dole money had not come through. Master Rampersad was obviously anxious for it, as he barged his way to the front of the queue. When told to wait his turn he became angry and stormed out, picked up a brick and hurled it through the office-window, showering everyone with glass.

His vengeance was not over yet, though. A short time later, he returned armed with a carving knife and a cricket bat. He went into a frenzy and began smashing windows as clerks locked themselves into

offices for safety. Then the police arrived—ten of them with truncheons drawn and using riot shields! But even these odds were not too much for the indefatigable Rampersad. As the police tackled him from different directions, he lashed out with the knife and bat. One constable suffered a serious stab wound to the leg, another had his hand fractured by the bat, a third was bitten on the thumb and another suffered a cut arm and a swollen knee.

And Rampersad's punishment? Was he deported? Not a chance. Judge Mervyn Griffith-Jones, at the Old Bailey last month, was going to put him on probation. That is, until Rampersad refused the offer and declared he would not co-operate with the probation officer. Only then was he landed with three years' inside!

It looks as if the 57th variety of Trotskyism has at last been born with the recent split in the ultra-Left International Socialists. No doubt the new group emerging from this will soon be proclaiming its own Simon Pure brand of workers' revolution and busy itself slinging mud at all the other Reds as middle-class revisionists, Stalinists and C.I.A. agents, though just how genuinely horny-handed these latest sons of toil will turn out to be awaits to be seen. If they are anything like the host of other Leftist groups, we need only count the number of coloureds, students and wild-eyed fanatics who take to the streets under their banner to see how shallow are their roots in the working-class.

There are many peculiar phenomena to be found in the murkier reaches of the Left, and factionalism is only one of them. Particularly popular is name-changing. The founder of the International Socialists rejoices in the name of Ygael Gluckstein . . . or rather, he does not do so very often, preferring to be known by the more English handle of "Tony Cliff". Then there is his wife Chanie Rosenberg, who writes in *Socialist Worker* under the name "C. Dallas", and her brother Michael Rosenberg, whose alias is "Kidron".

Their name-changing activities should not be thought of as anything new, of course. It is part of the tradition of the revolutionary Lefty to bestow on

himself an assumed name by which to be known by the proles. Karl Marx's real name, for instance, was Mordecai, while in Russia Lenin was originally Oulianov, Trotsky was Bronstein, Zinoviev was Apfelbaum, Parvus was Helphand, Stalin was Djughashvili, and so on interminably. The purpose of this masquerade was to discard the alien agitator image, but just think how much more colourful Left-wing terminology would be had these original names been retained. All the Leftists would be known as Mordecaists, while their main two factions would bear the names Mordecaist-Oulianovism and Bronsteinism. As for the standard term of abuse applied by Reds to each other, this would no longer be the mundane-sounding "Stalinist", but an electrifying, tongue-twisting "Djughashvilist"!

And how about the "Conservative" Right—the Celtic sounding Burns for Bernseig, head of the Federal Reserve Board, as a fair example of some of that body's most prominent members' need for deed polls?

SIGNIFICANT OMISSION

In the avalanche of comment concerning the "massacre of the British mercenaries" no-one but Mr. Patrick Wall, M.P., has identified the F.N.L.A. with U.P.A., that collection of murderers who made themselves infamous in Angola in 1961 by putting wounded men, women and children through bandsaws just for amusement. When Holden Roberto was later asked if they had done this, he grinned broadly and said: "Yes, we put them through feet first."

UNWELCOME ADVICE

Remember ex-Senator William Fulbright, who roused the wrath of certain people in the States when he charged that the "Israeli lobby controls 85 per cent of the Senate"? Their money power brought about Fulbright's defeat in the last election. Now he has done it again. During a dinner Fulbright suggested to President Ford's Chief Economic Advisor, Alan Greenspan, his idea for saving New York City from default. "Wouldn't it be appropriate", Fulbright asked, "if the New Yorkers who have raised big sums for Israel held some bond drives for New York"? No wonder brickbats are being hurled in his direction once more!

James K. Warner's CHRISTIAN VANGUARD

£3 for 12 Issues

PO BOX 426, METAIRIE,
La. 70004, USA

SPOTLIGHT ON THE BILDERBERGERS

A Single Publication

EXAMINER BOOKS, 783 NEW YORK
N.Y. 10022, U.S.A.

Price - \$3.50

LIGHT AND BITTER

STAMP OUT SEXISM!

Demands in the Commons from Tory MPs for a Home Office move to preserve the category of "lady rider" in horse-racing were turned down by an Under-secretary, Dr. Shirley Summerskill. Under the new Sex Discrimination Act, lady riders are now to be known as "horse-persons".

Rumours have been denied by the Government that the first prosecution arising from this Act will be against the Almighty for his sexist persistence in creating a human form in two different shapes and with two different functions, instead of conforming with the law and evolving a new type of hermaphrodite.

WORKING-CLASS HEROES

The red carpet has been laid out in the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany for the wife and kids of Des Warren, one of the "Shrewsbury Two" jailed for the havoc he and other "flying pickets" created during a building site strike two or three years back. At a special holiday camp for Communist "trades unionists"—well, that's what *they* call themselves—the Warren family was apparently treated to a slap-up time.

The family of Clifford Grocott, another man involved in the Shrewsbury fracas, were not so lucky. Their breadwinner's problem was that he had been on the *receiving* end of the flying pickets' "industrial action" and ended up partially blind for his troubles. So, as far as the Reds are concerned, they can whistle. No Victorious Internationalist Perfidy treatment for them.

DISCRIMINATION!

£1,250 has been coughed up from Labour Party funds to enable African terrorists to carry on with their tricks, according to an announcement by—inevitably—Judith Hart. Yet strangely at the same time the Prime Minister was reported as condemning the collection of funds in the United States which find their way into the pockets of I.R.A. gunmen in Ulster.

Why the discrimination? The I.R.A. regards itself as just as much a "liberation movement" as Z.A.N.U., Z.A.P.U. and all the rest of them in Africa. Surely if the latter lot are worthy of subsidies, a few bob could have been forthcoming for our home-grown "liberators"? But then, consistency has never been a Socialist virtue.

ATTENTION! ATTENTION!

"ISRAEL AND ZIONISM ARE UNDER ATTACK!"

"Show your scorn for the outrageous Anti-Zionist resolution of the U.N. General Assembly;

"Show your solidarity with Israel;

"Show that you believe in the right of the Jewish people to a National Home;

"Show that you believe in the National Liberation Movement of the Jewish People—the Zionist Movement.

"Join the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland NOW."

—*Jewish Observer*, January 2nd.

So now you all know! !

FOR THE GUINNESS BOOK OF RECORDS?

An unusual court case a few weeks ago highlighted the extraordinary lengths to which our Welfare State goes in feather-bedding the life of the drone, sponger and drop-out, at the expense of hard-working folk. A 47-year-old one-time carpenter, Albert Thorogood, was found guilty of neglecting to maintain himself and his wife. During the proceedings, it was revealed he had received not a penny less than £12,000 in social security benefits during almost twenty-five years of worklessness.

One of the methods used by the Department of Health and Social Security in trying to get him back to work was a three-month resettlement course designed to "provide a sense of discipline in matters such as getting up in the morning". So great a strain did this put upon the delicate Mr. Thorogood that he dropped out after just two days! Maybe the firm application of a hob-nail boot to his behind would have had more effect.

Read
SPEARHEAD

Edited by John Tyndall

Sample Issue 15p from

**91 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON - MIDDLESEX**

REASSURING NEWS?

How many folk on the Continent breathed a sigh of relief when the leaders of the French and Italian Communist Parties, the largest in Western Europe, declared themselves in favour of Parliamentary democracy and the right of every nation to decide its own political and social future? It must have been immensely reassuring to millions of Frenchmen and Italians to be told by these Parties that they will respect "the verdict of universal suffrage" and that if they win power at elections through the ballot-box they will relinquish it if voted out again.

The only trouble is, some sour-puss usually comes along and tartily reminds people of Lenin's statement that "Communism rejects Parliamentaryism . . . there can be a question of only utilising bourgeois state institutions with the object of destroying them".

LIVING IN THE THICK OF 'EM?

Lord Boyle of Handsworth is emerging, it seems, as a clear favourite for the post of chairman of the new Race Relations Commission to be formed by the merger of the Race Relations Board and the Community Relations Commission.

He certainly has the right form. As plain old Sir Edward, M.P., he fought long and valiantly in the 1960s against the restrictions on immigration demanded by hate-filled, wild-eyed Britons. And the good lord knows a lot about integration, too. From the vantage-point of Ockham House, his 24 roomed manor home in the heart of idyllic rural Sussex, he was in an ideal position to give unprejudiced, unbiased advice to his constituents in Handsworth, Birmingham on the desirability of integrating with their coloured neighbours. No doubt, we can look forward to great things from him if he gets his new job.

TOEING THE LINE

While not supporting the Watch Tower movement, *Candour* notes that Jehovah's Witnesses in Malawi are having a rough time of it, by all accounts. A copy of the sect's magazine, *Awake*, reports that frequent beatings, rapes, robberies, sexual tortures

and other gentle methods of persuasion not uncommon to Africa are being employed by the Malawi Government against Witnesses, simply because they are barred by their faith from joining political parties.

Awake claims that since October, parents have been separated from their children, including unweaned babies, and put in detention camps or barbed-wire enclosures. Many have scarpered into the forests of the Malawi-Mozambique border. Now there's a model of moderate, responsible Black African state for you supporters of Dr. Vorster's African détente. It will be remembered that another ally—the saintly Kaunda of Zambia—disposed of Alice Lenshena's followers in the same way for the same reason.

A RED SENSE OF HUMOUR

Alistair Cooke recounted a good anecdote in his *Letter from America* on B.B.C. Radio a few weeks ago. It seems that a British politician visiting Peking asked Chairman Mao what he thought would have happened if Mr. Khrushchev, not President Kennedy, had been assassinated.

After an apparently portentous pause for reflection, Mao replied, dead-pan: "I don't think Mr. Onassis would have married Mrs. Khrushchev."

GOOD ADVICE

"If you get fed up, knock off. Go for a ten mile walk with a dog, then re-read Kipling's *If* before going to bed. Next day, work like hell."

—Arnold Leese, 1931.

WHEELBARROW BOYS

The basic aim of a London Commonwealth Institute exhibition, organized largely by Oxfam, is to show how schools can get involved in the developing "Third World". One object on display is a wheelbarrow designed by Leicestershire school children for use in Nigeria. You might think that Nigerians could make do with the standard equipment which has been in use for very many years in civilized countries but you would be wrong. As was evidenced in Tanganyika Territory (now Tanzania) at the time of the ill-fated Ground Nut Scheme, Africans tend to carry loaded wheelbarrows on their heads unless instructed in the art of pushing them. It is to be hoped that this was explained to the Leicestershire youngsters and that their design incorporated a comfortable rubber pad on the underside of their wheelbarrow in order to protect what few brains Nigerian agriculturists may happen to have.

JANUS

HEED

Edited by Bruce A. Larsen

A new informative 20-page illustrated journal which is rocking New Zealand

Sample Copy - 50c

Per annum - NZ \$3

PO Box 52-118 Kingsland, Auckland 3
New Zealand

WHEN REBELLION WOULD BE LEGAL— THE IMMIGRATION TUSSLE

by DOWAGER LADY BIRDWOOD

Chairman of the Anti-Immigration Standing Committee with acknowledgments to "The Free Society"

Travelling round this country one hears growing evidence of quiet and utterly determined resistance to the Government's continuing immigration policy. The politicians themselves are silent but theirs is an unnatural silence in which common sense and reason have apparently been overruled by official diktat which runs something like this: "Ignore public disquiet and discontent. Say nothing and the whole race issue will subside and finally disappear." All the signs are that, far from disposing of the problem, official silence and refusal to listen to the indigenous, is exacerbating it. Whether it be school heads who have "no room" for coloured pupils, working men's clubs who are sticking to white membership, great numbers of nurses, doctors, sales staff, railway workers, factory employees, telephonists, etc., who are leaving jobs, homes—even their country—to avoid further contact with the invaders, they all now realise that the race laws protect only the coloured newcomers, and that the more they associate with them, the more they are at risk from official witch-hunting and a charge of discrimination.

No Government can hope to dictate a man's tolerance of something on which he has been denied all consultation or choice and for which he has no taste; even less, therefore, is legislation likely to bring about the desired result. If the proposed new Race Act should ever become law on the lines indicated in the Government's White Paper on Racial Discrimination, then the only course patriotic, sane Englishmen can take is to disregard it. Any law that is clearly seen no longer to represent the national interest must automatically undermine the Rule of Law, because it invites defiance.

The attitude of successive governments and their race agencies towards race relations plainly indicates

that they have either totally misunderstood the experiment in multi-racialism which they are trying to inflict upon us, or that they are deliberately using race relations and its overpowering ramifications simply in order to induce us to extend a phoney equality to alien peoples—many of them primitive—to acquire for them a status not in keeping with their civilisation, talents or natural inclinations.

The conspirators behind this silent and relentless invasion have seemed to have their way up to now simply because your true Briton is a kindly, tolerant and unsuspecting person, who has hitherto taken for granted the patriotism of those who govern him. Now, however, confronted by a situation hostile to himself and his whole way of life from the legal and often illegal entry of some seven million coloured foreigners (their own figure), he has suddenly realised the magnitude of the betrayal being perpetrated against him. He has very little stomach for violence and he does not see that the newcomers are to blame, so he is left staring angrily into the face of white treachery. What he sees there he despises and condemns and in his quiet, determined way he is making up his mind to have no more of it. The unparalleled evil and chaos that have come to Britain from continuous coloured immigration are not of his wishing or making. The gauntlet is now at the feet of Parliament. Englishmen, ever slow to go to war, but seeing their whole way of life more and more geared to alien customs, needs and demands, while their own interests are betrayed, are closing ranks. The politicians must either listen to white constituents and speak up in Parliament against the proposed new Race Act, or look to their own electoral and other defences.

A MOMENT'S CLEAR VISION

"Bolshevism is a close tyrannical bureaucracy, with a spy system more elaborate and terrible than the Tsar's, and an aristocracy as insolent and unfeeling, composed of Americanised Jews. No vestige of liberty remains, in thought or speech or action."

—Bertrand Russell, 1920

The Newly Formed

CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY

will hold a Meeting in

THE GREAT HALL - CENTRAL HALL
WESTMINSTER

SATURDAY, 24th APRIL, 1976

Information from :-

The Christian Assembly
25 Morpeth Mansions, Morpeth Terrace
London, S.W.1

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Madam,

While agreeing broadly with Kevan Bleach's remarks about the hypocrisy of the Government's proposals on devolution in that Britain's authority to devolve or alter the channels of power is being progressively transferred to Brussels, and that all genuine Nationalists should look for the devolution (or sovereign transfer) of real power from Wall Street, I think the author is being less than fair to the movements that have given rise to the idea of devolution.

In your editorial for the January issue of *Candour* you write of the "hidden" powers that destroyed the Russian, German, Austro-Hungarian, British, French, Dutch and Belgian Empires. You also mention the establishment (by William Paterson) of the Bank of England in 1694 and correctly indicate the seedbed of the disease that has acted as a cancer in the structures of all the past empires mentioned. The evil influences were surely within the "money power" before it was transferred in 1913 from London to New York and have seriously eroded the moral and cultural good undoubtedly spread by these empires.

Article VI of the Treaty of Union of 1707 states that "all parts of the United Kingdom for ever, from and after the Union, shall have the same allowances, encouragements, and drawbacks, and be under the same prohibitions, restrictions, and regulations of trade, and liable to the same customs and duties on import and export", etc. It is obvious that all this has not been effected during subsequent years. While admitting the early benefits to Scotland during the 18th and 19th centuries, the more recent centralising trends have certainly delayed and perhaps rendered impossible the realisation of the requirements of Article VI. The rise and continued persistence of Home Rule movements since the 1880s surely indicates serious defects in the 1707 treaty which was supposed to be the willing partnership between the two principal British nations for future prosperity. The present demand for "devolution" (devolution?) conceals and confuses the continued yearning for this objective, the partnership between two ancient nations (which existed for longer than the supposed British nation reckoned to be created in 1707).

It is indeed possible that the Assemblies produced by "devolution" could result in a superfluous tier of government. But Scottish nationalists, and many other Scots besides, do not think so, as the regional structures recently set up, remote and nowhere popular (outside the bureaucracy) could be abandoned.

The whole conception of devolution, and the sprawling "great debate" that is taking place (or being manipulated) can be seen as a comprehensive smoke-screen for the real debate that can be said to have started in 1715 or perhaps even earlier, and which has tried to realise the genuine partnership presumably desired by some of those who promoted the Union of 1707. Such a partnership could only be achieved through a co-operation of free nations, and this did not take place at the time of the Union. Common objectives such as the development of the Empire and the collaboration against (carefully manipulated) tyrannies have encouraged a considerable degree of cohesion of the British peoples in the succeeding years. No rational British parliamentary system was inaugurated in 1707 with the result that England "got off to a flying start" in extending its institutions unadulterated over the whole island (cf numeration of monarchs, etc.). A British nation that is seen abroad as England is a false entity and cannot be regarded as a peaceful co-operation between Saxons, Angles, Jutes, Danes and Celts. What is needed is not mere "devolution" but an honest re-negotiation of the Treaty of Union by free, fully responsible national communities, and unless future developments take place with this objective clearly in view harmonious and profitable associations between the nations of the United Kingdom, and the continuing integrity of the United Kingdom, will, in my view, not be possible.

R. H. JOHNSTON STEWART
Scotland

Editor's note: We agree—our whole aim is to achieve honest representation for our "fully responsible national communities". Reasonable subjects do not fight to escape *good* government.

RECOGNISING TRUTH

One has to learn to detach one's thinking from every desire and interest, from every sympathy and antipathy—like ridding oneself of superfluous tissue, the tissue of untruth which every human being tends to accumulate for his own comfort and protection.

—Liddell-Hart

POVERTY AMIDST PLENTY

F. T. North

Madam,

The recent furore created by the resolution voted in the United Nations equating Zionism with racism has one significant facet. In the volume of protests, shrill condemnation and demands for punitive reprisal against the participants in this outrage, no one denies the veracity of the accusation. Obviously then the displeasure of the Jewish community at the resolution is not because it's untrue but quite the contrary.

An attitude most astute because too many Jewish leaders have not only confessed but boasted of their racial solidarity. I quote Dr. Jakob Klatzkin, "We recognize a national unity of Diaspora Jews—the boundaries of your lands cannot restrict our movements—we are a nation within a nation; as a state within a state—we were never just a religious community—we can only live freely among peoples who have not yet reached their national maturity."

I can well understand the frustration and chagrin of this elite power group, when even they are forced to concur with the truth of Mr. Lincoln's adage about fooling all the people, all the time and the disquiet such a conclusion must arouse in the Jewish consciousness; however, they should not be overly worried, renegade goyim with characteristic stupidity will eagerly collaborate in their own destruction and control.

All will assuredly go according to plan and with the communications media their obedient lackeys, when the Israelis pulverize fifty million Arabs with atomic weapons, it will be dutifully hailed by our moulders of public opinion as a "bloodless coup".

IRVING TENNANT
U.S.A.

OBITUARY

Mrs. ETHEL ISEMONGER

Candour has lost a friend indeed. We are sad to learn of the death just before Christmas of Mrs. Ethel Isemonger. We shall remember her for a gallant patriot, a longstanding, generous contributor to *Candour* and a good and faithful friend to us and to our cause. May her dauntless soul rest in peace.

Familiar as we are with Stop-Go conditions, we are now in the middle of a world financial depression wherein inflation accompanies unemployment, the pound sterling totters, and we are told "Britain is finished" and faces bankruptcy.

How can a nation become bankrupt? The mere idea is ridiculous, and could only be put over on a brain-washed, supine people. Brain-washed we may be, supine we are not. The sun, the source of our energy, moves in its orbit. Nature is prodigal, our factories can produce real wealth and our people are, given the chance, as energetic and inventive as ever.

It is a fact that in Britain we produce more food per man per acre than anyone in the world. We owe a deeper debt than we can repay to those in agriculture. Our engineering designers, contractors and consultants are known and respected throughout the world, and our quality is good overall.

Contrasting this with Russia, we find that in Czarist times the Ukraine alone was a major grain exporter, whereas three times in the last decade Russia has had to be baled out with Western wheat. It is known that Soviet technology is based on, and dependent on, Western technology. The U.S.A. and other Western powers are granting vast credits for the supply of complete factories and technology . . . and at lower interest rates than we would be granted when borrowing money abroad!

Our children are taller and healthier than even a generation ago, we still encounter (and expect) kindness and courtesy, and our business friends are still as co-operative in intention, if not always so in action due to financial stringency.

I believe the heart of Britain beats with a sound, steady pulse. We may not be a great nation numerically, but we are a great people. Since when did Britons fear odds?

We are told we are financially poor when, in fact, we are rich in real wealth, and our potential is enormous if our engineers are given their head in the matter of automation and computerisation. It is as if we have a train waiting and ready to go in the station, but no passengers are allowed to board because no tickets have been printed.

We need to reform our money system so that tickets equals seats. This way we would ensure that everything we produce could be consumed, subject to consumer demand backed by adequate purchasing power. So need we sit around bemoaning our fate in the midst of potential plenty?

Would a maggot starve because the apple was too big?

WHAT DOES CANDOUR MEAN TO YOU?

Does *Candour* provide you with answers to the questions that bewildered people ask in pubs, trains and buses knowing that something is rotten in the State?

Does it say what you would expect to read in the national press but never do?

Does it unfailingly give you the truth instead of the lying propaganda you see nightly on television and does it sometimes give you a chuckle at our smug, dishonest and oh! so boring politicians?

Does it make you feel that you are not alone in your thinking or positively "cubed" for your revulsion against the denigration of your religious beliefs and spiritual values, or does it embrace you in the growing army of politically educated people who see through the miasma of the media which aims to mesmerise you into acceptance of One World tyranny?

Does *Candour* lift your spirits by standing firm in its faith in Christendom and pride in the civilization brought in its wake?

Does it make you feel the world is a little cleaner for its condemnation of permissive educational methods, legalised vice and the filth of pornographic literature and so-called entertainment?

Do you support its determination to see an end to the mongrelisation of the white races?

Do you want us to continue to expand our links with like-minded patriots and keep burning, and indeed fanning, the flame which is now alight in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Rhodesia and many Continental countries?

Do you want *Candour* to continue its twenty-three years of unyielding struggle against E.E.C. membership; its condemnation of the hideous conditions under which British livestock is exported to the Continent; the enforced medication of our drinking water, and the "gifts" made with borrowed money by our bankrupt Government to the so-called Third World while it is estimated that 35,000 of our own old people will die this year from hypothermia?

Do you know that all of us in *Candour* who work for the Cause by researching, writing, publishing, despatching letters and literature all over the world do so entirely without payment?

Does *Candour* come into your house as a breath of clean wholesome air and do you know that it is read by patriots from Norway to Kuwait, from the Americas to Australasia, and is quoted in the most unexpected places by influential people with the courage of their convictions?

Do you agree with our Canadian reader who wrote to us of A. K. Chesterton saying: "It is a great tribute when those he left behind can so accomplish their task that 'he being dead yet speaketh'?"

IF YOU SAY YES TO THESE QUESTIONS, PLEASE READ ON

We have kept subscription rates as low as possible and have tried to make few appeals for funds. Now we are forced to make what is, perhaps, the most urgent plea of all. **ONLY YOU CAN SAVE CANDOUR.** Our growing correspondence, increased printing costs and astronomical postage rates will kill it unless **YOU HELP NOW.**

Please make a genuine sacrifice—not casually as you might shove ten pence into the Local's collecting box—but as a worthwhile contribution to your own future, that of your children and your heritage.

I recently attended two meetings where the speakers' oratory whipped up enthusiasm to such a pitch that nearly £3,000 was raised for the Cause. *Candour* cannot vocalise in ringing tones but we can promise that with even half that amount of money we could continue to keep faith with you our readers, faith with our race and country and faith with those who died for her. Without your immediate support *Candour* will not stay in the field until the war is won.

G. K. Chesterton wrote long ago: "We are the people of England and we have not spoken yet" . . . But, by God, we are speaking now and with His help and your contribution we can continue to publish truths to be shouted from the housetops to force the traitors to listen until we get the right rule we want or get ourselves jailed in the process.

PLEASE SEND YOUR DONATION NOW. Think of a sum—**DOUBLE IT**—if possible, **REDOUBLE IT** and sent it to the A. K. Chesterton Trust, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants. GU33 7DD.

M.T.S.

A MOMENT'S CLEAR VISION

Above whose battered standard ravens scream
And ne'er the sun of victory has smiled . . .
Out of broken grasp my sword now falls
As longing eyes still seek, in lost farewell,
One ray from Freedom's wondrous countenance . . .
But courage! Through this vale shall march my people—

O proud procession of the Future's seed,
The dying soldier greets thee, comforted!

*translated from the German
by Cecile von Goetz*